

## **B. REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. By this amendment, Claims 1-19 have been amended and new Claims 20 and 21 have been added. Hence, Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. The amendments to the claims and the new claims do not add any new matter to this application. Furthermore, the amendments to the claims were made to improve the readability and clarity of the claims and not for any reason related to patentability. All issues raised in the Office Action mailed July 23, 2002 are addressed hereinafter.

### **REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Brody*, U.S. Patent No. 5,495,613. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-19 are patentable over *Brody* for at least the reasons provided hereinafter.

### **CLAIM 1**

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for transforming character strings that are contained in a computer program that requires the steps of:

“automatically parsing a computer program to identify a hard coded string that is contained in the computer program;  
replacing the hard coded string contained in the computer program with a macro that is uniquely associated with the hard coded string;  
creating and storing an entry in a mapping that defines an association of the macro and the hard coded string; and  
referencing the mapping in a program element that is associated with the computer program.”

*Brody* describes an approach for extending the capability of a system editor using transforms. A transform is a new type of command that is created and stored in a library

of the system editor. From the perspective of the end user, transforms operate like other commands, e.g., macros.

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 includes several limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Brody*. For example, Claim 1 requires “automatically parsing a computer program to identify a hard coded string that is contained in the computer program” and “replacing the hard coded string contained in the computer program with a macro that is uniquely associated with the hard coded string.” *Brody* does not teach or suggest automatically parsing a computer program to identify a hard coded string and then replacing a hard coded string in the computer program with a macro. *Brody* does not even mention hard coded strings, let alone replacing them with macros. Even if in *Brody* a macro was considered to be a text string, *Brody* does not teach or suggest replacing macros with other macros or transforms in the system editor. Rather, in *Brody*, existing macros are supplemented with transforms. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the aforementioned limitations are not taught or suggested by *Brody*.

As another example, Claim 1 also requires “creating and storing an entry in a mapping that defines an association of the macro and the hard coded string.” *Brody* does not mention mappings of any kind, let alone a mapping with an entry “that defines an association of the macro and the hard coded string,” as is required by Claim 1. The portions of *Brody* referred to in the Office Action say nothing about mappings in general, or creating an entry in a mapping “that defines an association of the macro and the hard coded string,” as is required by Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 includes one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Brody*. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is patentable over *Brody*.

#### CLAIMS 2-6

Claims 2-6 all depend from Claim 1 and include all of the limitations of Claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 2-6 are patentable over *Brody* for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to Claim 1. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-6 recite additional limitations that independently render them patentable over *Brody*.

For example, Claim 4 further requires that “wherein the master control mechanism is configured to, based upon slave control process mechanism loading, dynamically reassign control, between the one or more slave control mechanisms, of one or more processing resources from the subset of processing resources and one or more storage resources from the subset of storage resources.” The Office Action asserted that in *Brody*, the processors 402-405 are the master control mechanism recited in Claim 1 and that sub-controllers 406A-409A are the slave mechanisms recited in Claim 1. Given this assumption, to satisfy the requirements of Claim 4, processors 402-405 would have to dynamically reassign, based upon the loading of sub-controllers 406A-409A, control of the resources 406-409 between sub-controllers 406A-409A. This is not in any way taught or suggested by *Brody*.

The Office Action also asserted that the limitations of Claim 4 are taught by *Brody* at Col. 4, lines 26-33. The text at this portion of *Brody*, however, describes only how processors 402-405 can gain control of resources that are allocated to other

processors. There is no mention or suggestion of processors 402-405 dynamically reassigning, based upon the loading of sub-controllers 406A-409A, control of the resources 406-409 between sub-controllers 406A-409A. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 4 is also not taught or suggested by *Brody*.

#### CLAIM 7

#### CLAIMS 8-13

Claims 8-13 contain limitations similar to Claims 1-6, except in the context of computer-readable media. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 8-13 are patentable over *Brody* for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to Claims 1-6.

#### CLAIMS 14-19

Claims 14-19 contain limitations similar to Claims 1-6, except in the context of computer systems. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 14-19 are patentable over *Brody* for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to Claims 1-6.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-19 are patentable over *Brody*. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Brody* is respectfully requested.

#### NEW CLAIMS 20 AND 21

New Claims 20 and 21 recite limitations similar to Claim 7, except in the context of a computer-readable medium and an apparatus, respectively. It is therefore respectfully submitted that new Claims 20 and 21 are patentable over *Brody* for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to Claim 7.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that such contact would be helpful in furthering the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP



Edward A. Becker

Reg. No. 37,777

Date: September 23, 2003


1600 Willow Street  
San Jose, CA 95125  
(408) 414-1204  
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on September 23, 2003

by

  
Sheila Severinghaus